

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria. Virginia 22313-1450

P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov	

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/540,020	06/22/2005	Takafumi Kawasaki	025260-099	8858	
21839	7590 10/23/2006		EXAM	INER	
BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC			NGUYEN,	NGUYEN, DUNG V	
POST OFFICE ALEXANDRI	E BOX 1404 [A, VA 22313-1404		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3723			

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/540,020	KAWASAKI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Dung V. Nguyen	3723				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	·					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 S	September 2006.					
	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
	The state of the s					
closed in accordance with the practice under b	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1.3-6 and 8 is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 and 3-5 is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 6 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 8 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	drawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 22 June 2005 is/are: a		by the Examiner				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	xaminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) □ All b) □ Some * c) ☒ None of: 1. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachmont/c\						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/22/2005. 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/540,020 Page 2

Art Unit: 3723

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of species 4, claims 6 and 8, in the reply filed on 26

September 2006 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al (USPN 6,832,606). Yamada et al discloses a multi-wire saw 1 for cutting a workpiece W while supplying a slurry containing abrasive grains to a wire 15 traveling between a plurality of rollers 11, 12 comprising a slurry supply mechanism having an holding portion 10 for holding the slurry and a temperature control mechanism for keeping the temperature of the slurry constant and to supply the slurry to the wire 15 as the wire 15 passes through the holding portion 10, a surface 21 constituting the holding portion 10 provided with a passage hole 21' allowing the wire 15 to pass therethrough. Yamada et al does not disclose expressly the holding portion 10 is provided on an upstream side of a site where the workpiece W is cut (note Fig. 1-4, col. 3, line 8 to col. 6, line 2). At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of

Application/Control Number: 10/540,020

Page 3

Art Unit: 3723

design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the holding portion on upstream side of the cutting site because Applicant has not disclose that providing the holding portion on an upstream side of cutting site provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with the holding portion is provided at the cutting site because the holding portion performs the same function of supply the slurry the wire. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Yamada et al to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Okumo et al, Hayashi et al and Huber et al are cited to show multi-wire saws.
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung V. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4490. The examiner can normally be reached on IFP Program.

Application/Control Number: 10/540,020

Art Unit: 3723

7. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph J. Hail can be reached on 571-272-4485. The fax phone number for

Page 4

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DUNG VAN NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER

DVN October 19, 2006